

Appl. No. 10/648929  
Reply to Action dated 3/28/2006  
Page 8

### REMARKS

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Claims 1 and 7 remain pending.  
Reconsideration and reexamination of the application are requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 7 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner indicated that in line 6 of claim 1, that it is unclear whether the memory referred to was meant to be the ROM or the memory cited at line 2. Claim 1 has been clarified by inserting the language "separate from the memory" in line 7 and using similar language in claim 7. This language makes it clear that the memory referred to in line 3 is different from the ROM. It is submitted that claims 1 and 7 are now definite.

Claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form and includes the amendment making it clear that the memory is separate from the ROM.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious on consideration of Joao.

Claim 1 has been amended to include several "means for" elements. Joao does not disclose or point to these elements, particularly with respect to an electric power steering control device. Hence, claim 1 does not follow from and is non-obvious over Joao.

Claim 7 was indicated to be allowable. Claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form and in a fashion which overcomes the 112 rejection.

Appl. No. 10/648929  
Reply to Action dated 3/28/2006  
Page 9

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are requested. Allowance of claims 1 and 7 at an early date is solicited. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. No. 29,165 at (612) 455-3802.



Dated: June 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &  
LARSON, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2902-0902  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902  
(612) 455-3800

By: Curtis B. Hamre

Curtis B. Hamre  
Reg. No. 29,165  
CBH/lad